UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Conversion of Hamilton Fish

By Brent Dow Allinson

Taking Time to Think It Through - - - - - - - *Joseph Ernest McAfee*

American Notes - - *Sydney Strong*

The Basic Principles of Adult Education - - - - - - - *Curtis W. Reese*

Antiquated Laws and Their Outgrown Usefulness - - *Isidore A. Blanch*

Book Reviews: *John Haynes Holmes, Taraknath Das, Robert C. Schaller*

VOLUME CXVI NUMBER 4

Chicago, October 21, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)
Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 63
Taking Time to Think It Through—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 65
Jottings—J. H. H. 66

ARTICLES—
Why Men Fight—*Henri Barbusse* 63
American Notes—SYDNEY STRONG 67
The Conversion of Hamilton Fish—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 69
The Basic Principles of Adult Education—CURTIS W. REESE 71
Antiquated Laws and Their Outgrown Usefulness—ISIDORE A. BLANCH 73

POETRY—
The Peace-Makers—ROBERT WHITAKER 68
Evening Song—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW II 68
Unos Est Artifex Deus—FLORA WHITE 68
Icarus—ELSA TUDOR 68

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Menace of Rome—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 74
Reorganization of the Government of the United States of America—TARAKNATH DAS 75
The Prince of Romance—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 77

CORRESPONDENCE—
Italy's African Colonies Now Sufficient for Her—S. H. WALDSTEIN 78
Equality of Opportunity—WINIFRED B. COSSETTE 78
"If This Be Treason"—JAMES A. FAIRLEY 78
A Canadian Says Something About Britain—JOHN ROWLAND 78
Praise—and Honest Opinion—W. B. CHAPMAN 79
The Divine—JOHN W. BARWELL 79

THE FIELD—
The Ministers Union of America 62
Henri Barbusse 79
Jane Addams and the Austrian Premier—*The Christian Leader* 79
The Ten Commandments of Fascist Italy 80

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Ministers Union of America

Believing that "social injustice cannot be eradicated without the efficient organization of those who engage in socially necessary labor," a group of clergymen of various denominations and faiths organized the Ministers' Union of America in April, 1931. In 1935 the Ministers' Union applied for affiliation with the American Federation of Labor, although such affiliation has as yet not been effected. The Ministers' Union, which accepts into its membership any clergyman of whatever faith, who is in sympathy with the purposes of the Union, states that the form of its organization is modeled on the lines of labor organizations in general because these ministers felt "they could increase their own usefulness as workers in the professional field and more effectively express their oneness with those who do the work of the world." The Reverend David Monroe Cory is president of the Union and Reverend George Grover Mills is executive secretary and organizer.

Through its Union Label Committee the Ministers' Union has recently instituted a campaign for obtaining the support of churches and other religious organizations for union labor. As a first step in their campaign they are urging all ministers in New York City to have printing done in union shops and to have the union label appear on such printing. The Economic Justice Commission of the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation has committed itself to this program and the Federal Council of Churches has taken a stand in favor of organized labor, according to a statement made by the Union.

In carrying out their campaign for the union label the Union says in part that it is their purpose to "uphold a decent American standard of wages and to help increase the purchasing power of the nation," and on that basis urges religious groups to patronize those printers who are paying wages "above the standards of the NRA."

Their statement further says:

We should patronize organized labor because organized labor is in many respects practicing what we are preaching and is far more in harmony with the ideals of organized religion than those

(*Continued on page* 79)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVI MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1935 No. 4

WHY MEN FIGHT

"After all, what is it that makes the mass and the horror of war?"

"It's the mass of the people."

"But the people—that's us."

"Yes," I said to him, "yes, old boy, that's true! It's with us only that they make battles. It is we who are the material of war. War is made up of the flesh and the souls of common soldiers only. It is we who make the plains of dead and the rivers of blood, all of us, and each of us is invisible and silent because of the immensity of our numbers. . . . Yes, war is all of us, and all of us together."

"Yes, that's true. It's the people who are war, without them, there would be nothing, nothing but some wrangling, a long way off. But it isn't they who decide on it. It's the masters who steer them . . .

"After all, why do we make war?. We don't know at all why, but we can say *who* we make it for. If every nation every day brings the fresh bodies of young men to the God of War to be lacerated, it's for the pleasure of a few ringleaders that we could easily count; that if whole nations go to slaughter, marshaled in armies, it's in order that the gold-striped caste may write their princely names in history, so that other gilded people of the same rank can contrive more business, and expand in the way of employees and shops. . . .

"The people—they're nothing, though they ought to be everything."

"The peoples of the world ought to come to an understanding, through the hides and on the bodies of those who exploit them one way or another. All the masses ought to agree together."

—*Henri Barbusse* in "Under Fire."

The war has come! Located now in Africa, in the dread duel between Italy and Ethiopia, it burns like a fire which may at any time leap to the continent of Europe and become a conflagration. The chances of a European war by 1936, as estimated by Lloyds, are one in three—a quotation which may well make the heart quake with apprehension. Sentiment in this country seems to be dead set against any participation of the United States in the conflict—just as it was in 1914-1916, in the case of the last war! President Roosevelt has spoken clearly and nobly about our maintaining our neutrality and minding our own affairs—just as President Wilson did in 1914 when Germany went crashing into Belgium! All this is easy *now!* But what will happen if, when, and as some of our citizens are killed, our ships sunk, our interests attacked, our honor insulted by the combatants? Shall we repeat the experience of 1917, and go slipping down into the Avernus of arms, with Mr. Roosevelt, or some other president, blithely leading us. It seems incredible that we should ever be dragged into the trap again. *But already we are hearing whispers about fighting to save civilization. Again we are being told, today with Italy as yesterday with Germany, that a mad dog is loose, a brigand at large, and that we must resist and kill him, lest we perish.* In a few days, we have no doubt, we shall hear talk about democracy and what we must do to make the world safe for it, as already we are hearing talk about the League of Nations and our duty to vindicate its principles—yes, to have peace even if we have to fight for it! Is it possible that this old bunk can be used again—and that members of the same generation that were fooled by it once can now be fooled again? Verily, verily, as the scripture saith, "all things are possible." But we shall ourselves refuse to believe this horror till we have to. Two things are sternly to be kept ever in mind—first, that this Ethiopia-Italian struggle is simply the latest chapter in the old familiar imperialist game, in which all the nations are players, and that in any fight between them, whether or not under the auspices of the League, there are no ideal issues; and, secondly, that, even if there were, such issues cannot be served or saved by war. Now, as always, war destroys everything.

The cost of living is going up. Going up so fast and so far that by next spring most of us will be wondering how we can exist at all! In this, if in nothing else, has President Roosevelt fulfilled his promises, and done exactly what he set out to do. It was by raising prices that he was giving to break the back of the depression and restore prosperity. To this end he debased currency, destroyed plenty, created scarcity, ruined our export trade, and purchased silver and gold at crazy prices. And now that the cost of living is going up, *up*, UP, who is benefited? Not the millions of consumers who see meat soaring beyond their reach, bread moving out of their grasp, good clothing too luxurious to be worn. The people never prospered from high prices—nor honest business, which can only exist out of the purchasing power of the multitudes. No, the only persons who make anything out of higher prices are the exploiters who seek profits out of the necessities of men. It's the profit system, in other

words, which exacts high prices. Which shows precisely what the Roosevelt administration has been engaged in these last two years and more! The New Deal, so-called, is nothing in the world but a desperate attempt to get the old game working again—the old game of extorting profits for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many. That the administration is succeeding a bit is shown by the fact that dividends are increasing, stocks going up, luxuries multiplying, while the great masses of the people, the workers, are more miserable than ever before. Better business—but more unemployed, larger relief rolls, and an ever increasing national debt! And the reactionaries call the President a Socialist! We shall know when there is a Socialist in Washington, and a genuine New Deal, by falling prices, increased production, equitable distribution, and cooperation in economic life. High prices as a means of maintaining private profits is simply good old capitalism!

President Roosevelt took the lead in repealing Prohibition—and one of his reasons, perhaps the chief one, was the encroachment of Prohibition upon the liberty of the individual citizen. The people of this country sustained repeal—and one of the reasons, we were told, was the rebellion of the people, high and low alike, against the restrictions and denials imposed upon them by the 18th Amendment. Americans were not to be told what they could not do in so simple a matter as drinking—they were free, and would not surrender their freedom to a bunch of fanatical reformers. All of which is interesting in the light of the regulations and prohibitions, controls and denials, which have been shoveled out upon the citizens of this country during the last two years in the name of the New Deal! Are Americans free to do what they please, to manage their own lives, to live according to the dictates of their own consciences, and habits, and desires, and impulses? Not if the present administration has anything to do about it! To produce liquor is all right, in any quantities—and to buy it, and sell it, and consume it. O, yes! But to produce wheat, or cotton, or tobacco, or peanuts, or potatoes in any quantity, and to buy, sell, and consume the same, this is all wrong. Take potatoes, for example! The prohibitions laid upon this product surpass anything ever known in the prohibition of liquor. Under the Potato Control bill passed by the last Congress, production of potatoes is prohibited above a certain narrow minimum. All producers are prohibited from selling potatoes which are not placed in a package prescribed by law, and stamped with a government stamp. All purchasers of potatoes are prohibited from buying potatoes which are not packed and stamped as described. (Even in Prohibition days, the purchaser was never forbidden to buy liquor, nor punished for buying liquor!) All persons having information about "bootlegged" potatoes must give same to government agents under penalty of $1,000 fine or imprisonment for a year. (Even under Prohibition, enforcement officers never had any power to extort information from neighbors, by-standers, or even witnesses!) The Roosevelt administration justifies these potato laws on the ground of the public welfare. Well, the Prohibitionists used to talk about the public welfare, too! Why not?

Why is it so difficult to stir the public mind on the horror of our automobile slaughter in this country? The ghastly horror goes on day after day, but few seem to mind. On Labor Day, for example, some 300 persons were killed in automobile accidents on our highways. This was recorded in a brief story in our newspapers, with the comforting assurance that the total was considerably less than had been anticipated by police authorities. A few days later a tropical hurricane swept up the Florida coast and killed 250 persons. This death toll was 20 per cent *less* than the automobile toll, yet it was featured on the front-pages of our newspapers with headlines sensational enough for the proclamation of a war. One would think that the automobile disaster would be given a good deal more space and featuring than the tornado disaster, for all of us ride in automobiles, and few of us ever see Florida or experience a wind blowing at a 130-mile-an-hour pace. It's personal concern, say the news-hawks, which determines the publicity value of a story! But in this case there must be other factors involved. What is it that makes the 250 deaths in the hurricane so much more exciting than the 300-odd deaths in the Labor Day automobiles? First of all, as we see it, the Florida disaster was unusual, whereas the automobile accidents are the routine and therefore dull news of every day. Secondly, the deaths in Florida all occurred at one time—in one moment, so to speak—whereas the deaths in automobiles occurred at intervals through a considerable period of time. Lastly, and most important, the deaths in the tornado came at one stroke and in one place and thus were visualized as a single dreadful phenomenon, whereas the deaths on the highways were scattered all over the map of a great continent. The Florida cataclysm, in other words, was like a drama in a theatre; the automobile horror like a series of casual accidents on a street corner. Our automobile problem is fundamentally a psychological problem. Until we learn to dramatize it we are never going to get anywhere.

We welcome the growing agitation in this country against the participation of American athletes in the Berlin Olympics in 1936. Let it be said at once, in contradiction of anything and everything that is being said by Nazi propagandists, that the Olympics will not be conducted by the German authorities in accordance with the principles of fair play. Already Jews are being shut out of competition? Not openly and di-

rectly, of course—the Nazis are too shrewd to announce that Jews as such will not be allowed to compete. But we were in Germany this past summer, and can therefore testify at first hand that conditions in the Reich—in the athletic clubs and the sport activities—are such that no Jew today can get the training absolutely requisite for successful competition for places on the German team. And what applies to Jews applies as well to other outlawed groups in Germany. Under these conditions, we regard it as a matter of simple self-respect, to say nothing of fidelity to our American ideals of freedom and justice, that our athletes should refuse to go to Berlin. There is an ideal involved here which cannot be safely neglected. But there are also practical considerations! Thus, we can think of nothing which would so surely open the eyes of German citizens to the horror with which their government is regarded by the rest of the world as this proposed boycott of the Olympics. At present it is practically impossible to reach the German mind. Censorship barriers that mind against any slightest inkling of reality. But nothing could suppress the news that America would have no part in the games! There are the wonderful buildings erected in the outskirts of Berlin for the reception of the visiting athletes. All over the country has been conducted a campaign of publicity for this great event. Never have such preparations been made for any Olympic as for this of 1936. And now, if America refuses to come, it will be a body blow. Like a shock of cold water, it will awaken all Germans to a realization of where they stand in the high court of public opinion, and why. This chance should not be missed. For the Germans themselves, if not for ourselves, we should boycott the Olympics!

The church situation in Germany has at last reached a crisis, and the long rebellious clergy and their followers in the Confessional movement are face to face with the fateful decision between God and government which has so long been approaching. The protestant leaders have been fighting a brave fight, and twice at least have beaten back attack. Thus, in the early period of the controversy, Reichsbishop Ludwig Mueller proclaimed himself dictator of the churches. His move to this position of supreme power in religious matters was stoutly resisted and finally repulsed, with Mueller thrust into obscurity by the sheer refusal of the Protestants to recognize or obey him. Next, August Jaegar, acting as steward of the Reich churches, undertook to assert the authority of government by arresting and detaining in custody the bishops of Bavaria and Wurtemburg. The result was an uprising so determined that the government was frightened and cast Jaegar to the wolves. After this outbreak, there was a lull. When we were in Germany in June, nothing seeme quite so quiet as church affairs. Now, suddenly, like a lightning flash, there comes a decree, signed by Hitler himself, making the church legally subject to the state, and appointing Hauns Kerrl new minister of Church Affairs, with dictatorial powers. This outlaws the Confessional movement, and makes opposition to the government treason. The Chancellor has shrewdly undertaken to soften the blow by writing the opposition Protestant leaders to accept office as directors of the Reich Church under Herr Kerrl. Even Frederick von Bodelschwingh has been asked to become chief of the projected directorate. But this action is only bait to the trap. It is a deliberate attempt to buy off the leaders and end the schism. It is inconceivable that the Confessionalists can give way. Which leaves their situation, as the correspondent of the New York *Times* puts it, "desperate"! It is the final showdown. Either the Confessionalists must sacrifice their religious principles, or else break the laws of the land and become criminals. It is a terrible decision, calling for the iron blood of Luther.

Taking Time to Think It Through

Ordinarily premature political campaigns are to be deplored. Maybe an early beginning will not be so bad in the case of the national election of 1936. Strenuous as has been their thinking during the past few years, there is a deal of thinking yet to be done before voters shall be ready to choose wisely a year from this fall.

One observer remarked the other day, "This will be the dirtiest campaign in our history." It certainly will be bad if that is even approximately true; there have been some pretty dirty political campaigns in American history. It is doubtful, however, if this campaign will go to the extremes in mud-slinging which have sometimes occurred. But probably it will be bad enough.

Another observer, who is in touch with the forces centering in Wall Street, remarks that no money will be spared in the attempt to put the present administration out of office. This will probably be somewhere near the truth. The proponents of that policy declare that lavish expenditure in opposition is the only way to overcome the malign effects of the lavish expenditure of public funds, believed to work toward the support of the administration.

It would be re-assuring if signs as clear as those mentioned could be pointed out to show that the election will be conclusive, that it will establish constructive, forward-going policies in national affairs. If only the mud-slinging and the money-slinging were sure to come to something, there might be some condoning of

their evils. But if no good whatever is to come of them, they are going to be bad, indeed.

If these two evils are inevitable, the sooner their proponents get busy in their use, the better it will be; time and popular disgust will more certainly discount them. That consideration tends to approve an early beginning of the campaign.

An early campaign also keeps the hope glimmering that the election will amount to something more than a contest between an administration in power and an opposition. A successful opposition which is merely an opposition, the political forces which make it up having no coherence and no consistent policies, would be worse than a blundering but going administration re-instated in power.

The early campaign would, therefore, seem quite to the good. If it is not the best plan in the best of worlds, it is, at least, less bad than might be feared in a bad world. How deep-seated and general is the dissatisfaction with the present administration and its policies? What are the real grounds of dissatisfaction? These questions will be conclusively answered in a vigorous and early political campaign.

What has any other political group to offer which promises sounder national policies? That is the most important question involved in the election. If the time seems to have come to leap out of the frying pan, how hot is the fire in which one is destined to land? A wild leap just anywhere and in any direction would be foolish. There is always the chance that the frying pan will cool off a bit; an uncontrolled fire is insufferably hot.

A while ago the choice seemed to be between the present administration and one or another of the wild men now at large, with his wilder proposals. Time has worn down this peril considerably. The peril now is that a jumble of mutually antagonistic oppositionists will supply the alternative. Time offers some hope of wearing away this peril, also. So, let the campaign proceed.

For the moment oppositionism is exploiting Mr. Borah. This is to the good. Mr. Borah will go down in political history as The Great Objector. If oppositionism is to be political orthodoxy for a season, he would seem to have been born and politically bred for the leadership. Months of pondering and discussion will enable the voters to appraise the program which he would embody.

Is a one-man administration desired? How long would a man already past 70, with a recent break in health, last in an office of enormous responsibility, whose duties he has showed himself incapable of sharing with other strong men? No man of equal age has ever entered the presidential office, even when its exactions were much less than now. The president whose age nearest approached Mr. Borah's survived his inauguration only one month. What sort of a cabinet would hang together under such leadership? Could any but clerks and errand-boys be induced to stay by? Would clerks and errand-boys, dominated by a man grown old in shouting objections, supply a hopeful administration of national affairs?

Glamorous as may be any of the leadership proposed by the oppositionists, it is desirable that time be given to press to some conclusion such prosaic questions as these above. Time and the probing of public discussion will force all clamorous political groups to put up or shut up before the actual decisions must be reached by the voters. So, let's go on, and keep hoping.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

In 1914, a dispute in Serbia kindled a world war between Britain and Germany. Today, a dispute in Abyssinia is kindling a world war between Britain and Italy. Who says that empire is not the cause of war?

In 1914, Germany made "a scrap of paper" of her treaty with England and France guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium. Today Italy is making "a scrap of paper" of her treaty with England and France guaranteeing the independence of Abyssinia, to say nothing of her obligations under the Covenant of the League. Perhaps the problem of peace is the problem of persuading nations to keep their pledged and plighted word!

The potato legislation of the administration is a new Stamp Act. We wonder if it will meet with the same reception as the old Stamp Act. Will 1935 repeat 1765?

The U. S. Coast Guard, in September, captured a British rum-runner off the New Jersey coast carrying 5,000 cases of liquor valued at $200,000, the biggest cargo since the repeal of Prohibition. Our readers may remember that repeal was to end bootlegging!

Amid the vast flood of news about the college football teams, we discover a few tiny rills of information about students. The man from Mars infers that colleges are opened and students gathered, only to get the football season going.

New York City has seen, or will see, this season first-class dramatic productions of "Hamlet," "Macbeth," "Othello," "Romeo and Juliet," and "The Taming of the Shrew." Shakespeare seems to be even more alive than Bernard Shaw!

J. H. H.

American Notes

I am writing when the days and nights are of equal length—September 21st—at least they were said to be when I was in school. That always seemed to me to be a fair division of time. The sun comes up here in Seattle over the Cascades about 6 o'clock, touching my beautiful Queen Anne Hill with glory and arousing the big city in the valley to go to work—and at 6 o'clock dropping behind the Olympics, but first setting the golden lamps in the windows on Capitol Hill to the east. Mahomet's praise of Damascus would not have satisfied him if he had seen Seattle from Queen Anne Hill. Will my friends come out and see for themselves? The Athenians would have chosen this Hill for their Parthenon.

And to think that we had a prize-fight last night down at the foot of the Hill, where the Greeks would have located their amphitheatre. And next week there is to be a million-dollar prize-fight in New York City—within stone's throw of the Town Hall, where our editor-in-chief preaches the gospel every Sunday, quite near where the *Times* promotes the culture of refined society. Seems to me that I used up all my invectives 30 and 40 years ago, when the American public arose in their wrath and drove the prize-fight out of the land—over into Mexico and Cuba. That's the kind of deportation I believe in. Now it has returned, like the seven devils, worse than ever, quite as bad as bull-fights and gladiatorial fights! Our prize-fighters are now welcomed into college halls as teachers; marry our heiresses like British lords, and serve on governors' staffs. Does this have a hint of the fall of old Rome—noted for games, fights, doles, and chariots?

Our Seattle prize-fight was held in the Civic Auditorium. On the same evening in another room of the Auditorium, was held a mass-meeting attended by the governor and mayor in celebration of the United States Constitution. For the latter the hall was half-filled, although scores of patriotic bodies sponsored it. The other hall was packed. Admission to the Constitution meeting was free to the public. I need not say that a price of admission was charged for the fight! On account of the fight there was an unparalleled congestion of autos, packed in the streets for blocks! I never saw a greater congestion. To me prize-fighting is the acme of brutality—and, as it is handled today by promoters and gamblers—whew!! it smells like a carrion. Thanks are due Arthur Brisbane for his discerning comments on it. *Who will clean the stables?*

A night or two ago I accepted an invitation from Rev. Vincent Widney, of Monroe, to speak to his people. He is seeking to prepare his people for intelligent voting in a plebiscite to be taken soon by Congregationalists on the problem of War and Peace. Monroe makes a nice bus ride of forty miles to the north toward Canada, through the fertile country noted for Carnation Products—being the "home of contented cows." As one swings around the bends of the fine road on his way to Monroe, he cannot fail to observe many things from the window. Ugly advertising signs still swear at the landscape—although largely through the efforts of women there is a marked improvement. May the day be hastened when the last ugly "ad" shall cease to disfigure the scenery.

The little tin post-boxes still stand for American inefficiency! I suppose this is better than to ask farmers to go several miles to the country post-office for their mail. But since I discovered twenty years ago that the Japanese have universal delivery, to all houses, even following one as he may go on his vacation—I feel that the tin-boxes are proof of an incompetence that Americans ought to be swift to rectify. Who will lead in a crusade for universal delivery? And with thousands out of work!

There are many contrasts in this part of the land. I spent a few hours in one home which would compare in culture and comfort with our best homes. The little villages along the road, however, showed too much of the shack-age. There has been little improvement during the past several years, and they had never come to the maturity of an Ohio village. A general campaign of "fixing up" in this part of the country (this would apply practically to the whole land) would result in what might pass for a revival of prosperity. If the painter should begin to paint, and if the carpenter should begin to hammer, each one over against his own house, one could not promise too much as coming out of it, but it is certainly a little thing worth trying. These villages, and others like them, would put on a new appearance of life and prosperity.

There are interesting and inviting places along the road, intended to entice travelers to stop and enjoy themselves. One odd cafe brought a smile, carrying the big sign of "Dads and Mothers Cafe." As one travels he has constant proof that the Day of Prohibition is past, at least for the present!

Monroe is the seat of the State's largest reformatory for boys. The attendance runs in the neighborhood of four hundred. The morning paper carried the information that one of the prisoners had escaped that night. It was James Roberts, who had been sentenced to a two to five year term. He left a note saying, "I hate to do this, but feel that I have served enough time." Who of my readers would choose to stay in prison? That states the case with all of our penal institutions—from incorrigibles to boys. None of them desires to "stay." Therefore, such is the theory—there must be bars, guards, dogs and guns. Our prisons—Monroe is a suggestion—furnishes one of the burning "problems" of American society. That our prisons make criminals has been generally admitted. If there is one place where the principles of Christianity do not operate for the restoration of men who have broken certain rules of society, it is the prisons. The church at Monroe, for example, has a "problem" in the reformatory, which calls for study and social action. The solution would be of priceless benefit to mankind!

It is a most attractive field to enter and "problem" to tackle. Who will do it? I know that penal institutions can be run without great buildings, without guards and guns, without locks and bars, for I have several times visited such a prison in Australia, within fifty miles of Melbourne. That was ten years ago. My friend Samuel Mauger was chairman of the Parole Board. I know that "incorrigibles" can be so treated as to be brought back into society, to desire to "stay," entirely without bars and guns, because I know of such a place in Russia, within fifty miles of Moscow. There are 3,000 in this place. They are not "punished" if they decline to obey. They are absorbed by a large town of people who are busy producing for society, and they are brought out of the outlaw life of the old days and learn to enjoy working and producing instead of destroying. That is what I should call the "Christian

method." Who will tackle this prison "problem"? Meanwhile, tens of thousands of our young men and women are being trained for outlawry and crime. The judges are helpless; can only wring their hands, like Pilate. We are erecting great buildings in vain. We are spending millions of dollars in vain. *There is a good way to handle this problem.* Who is willing to study, to learn, and to apply the right way to America?

Where is the state, where the governor to tackle it? What about our school-system being big and wise enough to take over the offenders "against society" and restore them by patient handling and education. Meanwhile the church can begin to study and act! A social order that cannot restore its offenders should be fundamentally changed.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Seattle, Washington.

P. S.: Later.

I cannot refrain from referring to the service I attended this morning at the Church of the People. I question if a more intelligent and spiritual group was assembled in any part of the city. Fred W. Shorter, minister, in the first place had invited a quartette of Negro friends to sing several selections. It was marvelous. The Negroes should be given the task of teaching the rest of the human family *how to sing.* My mind traveled fast to Ethiopia when he read "Why Ruined Civilizations?" from these searching words of Ingersoll:

Their civilization was a lie. Their laws only regulated robbery and established theft. They bought and sold the bodies and souls of men, and the mournful wind of desolation, sighing amid their crumbling ruins, is a voice of prophetic warning to those who would repeat the infamous experiment, uttering the great truth, that no nation founded upon slavery, either of body or mind, can stand.

* * *

Whoever produces anything by weary labor, does not need a revelation from heaven to teach him that he has a right to the thing produced.

Mr. Shorter's sermon on the "Four Mistakes of Jesus" was simple, searching and appealing. And what were these "Mistakes" of Jesus?

1. He chose a poor place to live. The name "Nazareth" brought a smile of contempt, when it was mentioned as the origin of any "good." "Place-hunters" should take notice. And yet Jesus put "Nazareth on the map."

2. He chose bad companions, judging by the world's standards. He did not join the "Rotary" or take membership in the "University Club." In fact, he consorted with "Sinners." Many were not reputable!

3. He used bad methods. He had no sense of "publicity." He did not come late to public meetings to attract attention. He had no aptness for schools of salesmanship.

4. He used teachings that did not have the approval of sane and practical men. His injunction to turn the other cheek and pray for enemies was a "mistake." He would not compromise, not even to save his life. He could not save himself.

But this Jesus who "made mistakes" is the one who has found his way into the affection of mankind. *His life was not a mistake!*

S. S.

The Peace-Makers*

So this is Navy Day! and his the praise
Who won his hour's award for peaceful ways
The while he bared his teeth to all the world,
And so like bombs his benedictions hurled
The whole mad mess, today, of fighting men
Would have us share his warring peace again.

And we must make of these Pacific Seas
Such flowing shambles for the like of these
Another Roosevelt may so protest
That who wants peace must more and more invest
In what the profiteers of war would sell—
As who wants heaven must more invest in hell.

Beyond the Navy Day lies Christmas morn,
When we shall tell again how One was born
While angels sang good-will and peace on earth;
And we shall celebrate once more His birth
More panoplied on land and sea for war
With every year we blab of Bethlehem's Star.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

*For Navy Day—October 27, 1935.

Evening Song

The last tall pine has stabbed the sunset through
And torn to shreds her dancing, golden light;
The sky beyond's a deeper, haunting blue
Where now a lone loon's winging down the night.

The scent of evening fills the fragrant breeze
And drifts across the waters of the stream
To stir the dusky tops of forest trees,
Moving their shades among the soft stars' gleam.

Above a startled faun and dappled doe
The wraith of Beauty pauses in her flight
To smile on such a scene as lies below,
Blessing the mystic sacrament of night.

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW II.

Unos Est Artifex Deus

Autumn's blazing transciencies
fling dark shadows from above;
In the hush of their transparencies
sing of life and death and love.
Spiralled rhythms, void of sound,
stabbing us with presciencies
Bayonetted from the ground.
What is life and what is death?
Which is which? Or are they one?
What is love? When day is done
Will she, with caressing breath,
say the answer may be found
In the silence that is sound
when we are shadow vagrancies
Singing these same phantasies—
"Life and death and love are one."

FLORA WHITE.

Icarus*

Lauro de Bosis, you flew alone to Rome:
Alone you hovered in that dying day
Above your young who starve within the cage
Of Mussolini. Manna fell from you,
White words of flame to give them strength to die
For liberty. You swooped low to the steps,
The Spanish Steps and up them one by one
You flew while men and women gasped; and then
You rose in air but still your white words fell.
For one half hour you circled over Rome
Until the vultures came, nine hundred strong
For one lone bird. Then only did you turn
And soar toward the dying sun to sea.
The poor caged birds below now watch you go
To death alone, Oh Icarus, alone.
A speck against the fading light, you're gone!
No broken wings were found, no broken bird;
As the light goes, you went and left the Dark.

ELSA TUDOR.

*Suggested by Mr. Holmes's article on "The Greatest Single Deed of Heroism in Our Time," Published in Unity, April 16, 1934.—Editor.

The Conversion of Hamilton Fish

It may astonish readers of UNITY as it has astonished the writer, to learn that of all "the gentlemen of the Congress" now living, Hamilton Fish, of New York, Hamilton Fish, Republican, conservative, and alleged jingo Red-baiter, has, with the possible exception of Senator Capper, one of the longest and best records in support of legislation against war, and especially against the subversive international traffic in arms and munitions of war.

Having recently made an intensive study of the munitions question, of the Munitions Investigation and the history of legislation designed to cope with its diabolical evils, I am recording my discovery for the sake of truth and the record. The idea that the munitions-traffic is in a class by itself, that the production and distribution of arms and ammunition is as dangerous a business as the drug and liquor business, and as pernicious a traffic as the slave-trade, is not new. But, until recently, nobody has seriously endeavored to curb, or even to regulate, it in the United States, despite all the talk that has been going on for fifteen years at Geneva, and the bootless efforts to elaborate and conclude an effective international treaty for its control. To discuss peace, or to participate in the peace movement, without discussing the arms-trade and munitions-manufacture, with knowledge and a sense of reality, is like discussing prohibition without ever having seen a drunkard or a saloon, or endeavored to regulate the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages. It is like discussing abolition, without touching the problem of slave-trade; like an essay on Hamlet with the King deleted, or on Othello without Iago. One of the principal values of the Senate's munitions investigation is that it has made the nation munitions-conscious, made it aware of the sleepless commercial pressures and official military and naval lobbies for war and the perpetuation of the War System. Something must, and will, be done about it, now. Something, indeed, has been done. The new Neutrality Law is the first victory for peace since the Kellogg-Briand Pact. It will have even more practical consequences when its principle is generalized, to the discomfiture of belligerents.

Ever since Senator Hitchcock first proposed, with the approval of Secretary Bryan (and the disapproval of President Woodrow Wilson), to prohibit the export of arms and ammunition to belligerent nations, in 1914, much sentiment has prevailed in Congress to this end. Probably a majority of the membership of the committees on foreign affairs of both House and Senate, who have familiarized themselves with the question,—and have faced the naval and military officials, and the munitioneers, who have appeared before them to scotch this kind of legislation,—have for years favored the proposal to make unlawful the export of arms, munitions and implements of war, and the advancement of loans or commercial credits, directly or indirectly, to nations engaged in armed hostilities with other nations. It was the British ambassador who, in 1914, frightened and persuaded Mr. Bryan that to interfere with the freedom of trade and of export in arms and munitions of war, and to deny loans to belligerents would be an unneutral act—if performed by the United States after the outbreak of the European War. It would not, of course, be unneutral or illegal, provided the prohibition were made applicable to all belligerents equally. But Mr. Bryan was not sufficiently well-grounded in international law, perhaps, to know it, and to stand his ground—or was not master in his own house. Sweden and other neutral nations, much closer to the conflagration than the United States, prohibited the export of arms and munitions from their shores, early in the War, and thereby implemented and guarded their neutrality throughout the whole desperate period. We preferred to make money, recklessly,—and to lose it, ultimately, with a great deal more of our national integrity and of our heritage of civil liberty and social progress, by plunging into the delirium of the World War and abandoning all pretense, and all further defense, of the doctrine of neutral rights and duties.

II.

Now in the midst of an immeasurable depression and of chastened after-thought about the War — and in the presence of the heralded next war, — American opinion, as indicated by the recent action of Congress, desires to revive the respectable tradition of a century and half, and to return to the happy security of a fortunate isolation, as if nothing had happened to change our relationship to the world, and especially to the powers of Europe. Devoutly wishing that we had not bartered our political heritage of freedom for a mess of profiteering, of international politics and sour debts, we are re-appraising the potentialities, the virtues and validities of the law and policy of Neutrality, first proclaimed by President Washington as the bravest and most far-sighted act of his second administration. A Democratic House and Senate fell over themselves to pass, in August last, and cause the President to proclaim, a "mandatory" neutrality law, leaving little to his discretion in the matter of preserving the country from becoming involved in a threatening European war by reason of the hitherto untrammelled arms-trade. And it has become almost blatant Republican doctrine to wash pure American hands, in public, of "the whole European mess,"—and to assume that we have no responsibility for it, or for its perpetuation.

Among good Republicans and purists none has been more consistent than Mr. Hamilton Fish, or more idealistic in his attitude towards foreign affairs. Disillusioned by his service in the American army in France, he returned to the United States shocked at the failure of the Allied governments to disarm and at the general spectacle of European political depravity —and shocked again at the revelations of abandoned private profiteering, if not political depravity, at home. When the World Court was first at issue, he supported it in public speeches at Philadelphia and on the floor of the House,—although he tells me that he is not particularly proud of it now. That provided one more disillusionment for him. And when Senator Burton, of Ohio, returned from the Geneva Arms-traffic Conference, in the summer of 1925, with the harmless treaty that has just been ratified by the Senate,—after ten years of delay,—and offered a resolution to declare the policy of the United States "to prohibit the exportation of arms, munitions or implements of war to any nation which is engaged in war with another," whenever the existence of war is recognized by the President in making proclamation of the neutrality of the United States, Mr. Fish actively supported it. As such, its principal provisions were designed to be mandatory, not discretionary, upon the Executive, and to take effect

automatically as a corollary of the advent of a state of American neutrality. This was in 1926-1927.

In January, 1928, when the issue was on the Congressional carpet, shortly before the then Secretary of War appeared to oppose the passage of the Burton Resolution, Mr. Fish proposed a new and supplementary resolution in which he urged, in the name of Congress, that the President should negotiate a multilateral convention among all signatories of the Kellogg Pact, —and corollary to the Pact, — making the sale or shipment of arms and munitions of war, and the advancement of loans, illegal (to all nations engaged in hostilities in violation of the Pact), as a new principle of contractual international law. At that time, he made an eloquent speech, in the House saying among other things:

> Once public opinion understands the question of exportation of arms, America will no longer be the open slaughter-house of the world. Our people have higher ideals and are not in sympathy with making America the symbol of munitions and war. Let us say what we mean, and mean what we say, when we declare that we will not sell munitions of war to a belligerent, without the consent of Congress. Our people will know which side to take between peace and helping to make the world a shambles. . . . Why should profiteers in this country be permitted to embroil us in war with nations unable to receive munitions, because they do not control the seas?

Why, indeed! . . But, although bills to prohibit it have separately passed both House and Senate,—after having been fought bitterly by the munitions-interests (whose chief spokesman in the upper chamber was Senator Bingham of Connecticut), and steadily opposed by the Navy and War Departments,—the proposal has been as yet only partially written into law; and the United States is still the happy hunting-ground of the munitioneer, and of the foreign belligerent who requires war-materials other than arms, ammunition and implements of war—or the wherewithal to purchase them. Loans and credits may still be advanced as far as the Neutrality Act is concerned—although the Johnson Act prohibits loans to defaulting debtors and this applies to Italy in the present crisis.

III.

Declaring that a battle royal impends, similar and equal to the World Court controversy in importance, Congressman Hamilton Fish, Jr., who hails from the President's own Duchess County, New York, district, and is the ranking Republican member of the House Committee, defined the coming congressional controversy, in a frank interview with the writer on the eve of the passage of the Neutrality Act.

"The Administration," he said, "has at last revealed its obscure hand. It desires to play exactly the same dangerous cards in the hazardous international game, which President Hoover and Secretary Stimson desired to play when they requested authority from Congress in general terms, early in 1933, to impose embargoes on the exportation of arms, and the making of loans or commercial credits, by American citizens, to belligerent nations. They asked then, and President Roosevelt's State Department asks now, for authority to act, at the President's discretion, after consulting with the governments of other major munitions exporting countries, *against one warring party, perhaps, and in favor of another party.*"

"This represents no real advance towards peace," he continued. "On the contrary, I regard it as a proposal that conceals a dangerous step towards war. I am absolutely opposed to delegating any such unrestricted authority to any President, holding that it would be tantamount to delegating to him nothing less than the war-making powers, which are explicitly reserved by the Constitution to Congress. Both Senators Borah and Johnson agree with me."

"Do you mean that you think that it would be an unneutral act for the President to impose an arms—embargo against one party—let us assume, for the moment, to make it vivid, against Italy—and not against its opponent, if that party had been generally declared to be an aggressor against international law by, let us say, the League of Nations?"

"It would come dangerously near to being that, and to being war," replied Representative Fish. "I opposed the same idea in the case of the Japanese attack upon Shanghai; and I oppose it now. Any such decision as that must be made by Congress, not by the Executive, under our system of democratic government. Decisions as important as that should be made openly, and with the knowledge and approval of all our citizens, after debate, not through the confidential channels of diplomacy. It is not easy to be sure who is the aggressor in a war; both sides may be guilty. It is the going-to-war that is the crime; and selling munitions of war is aiding and abetting the criminals and should be stopped. I have been urging this step for at least five years. A bill of mine declaring this to be the policy of the United States, and asking the President to negotiate a new convention among all states signatory to the Kellogg Pact, proclaiming it to be the law of nations, is now before the House. If the Administration insists, for obscure reasons, upon having an unrestricted grant of discretionary authority to act in this respect, only one interpretation is possible,—and that is that it has no serious intention of remedying the dangerous and intolerable condition of affairs revealed by the Senate's munitions investigation,—a condition in which our neutrality policy is, in fact, made by the munitioneers and not by Congress,—or it wants to join the League of Nations, in fact, without authorization from Congress."

"You regard this matter as of the first importance?" I asked.

"War threatens to break out in Europe at any time," he replied, "and it will be a disaster if we adjourn without clearing up this matter permanently. The British Government has announced refusal of licenses to British citizens to ship arms and munitions to both Italy and Abyssinia; we should do likewise. Recognizing the importance of this matter, I am circulating a statement among some of my colleagues in the House, which I have signed. A number of others, I anticipate, will sign it immediately, as soon as they hear what the Administration is proposing."

The statement signed and circulated by Mr. Fish, but drafted by the writer, read as follows:

> Unquestionably, the munitions-traffic is an important contributing cause of war, which has twice involved the United States in hostilities with a foreign power. It remains a grave problem and a menace to the good relations of nations; and until it is regulated, it continuously threatens to compromise the neutrality and endanger the peace of the American people. The President himself stated, in a special message to the Senate, May 18, 1934:
>
> "The private and uncontrolled manufacture of arms and munitions, and the traffic therein, has become a serious source of international discord and strife. It is not possible effectively to control such an evil by the isolated action of any one country. The enlightened opinion of the world has long realized that this is a field in which international action is necessary. . . . Some suitable international organization must and will take such

action. The peoples of many countries are being taxed to the point of poverty and starvation in order to enable governments to engage in a mad race in armament which, if permitted to continue, may well result in war. *This grave menace to the peace of the world is due in no small part to the uncontrolled activities of the manufacturers and merchants of engines of destruction,* and it must be met by the concerted action of the peoples of all nations."

Despite this statement, and the prolonged investigation of the private munitions industries which followed it, revealing a dangerous condition of affairs, and a sinister lobby of commercial and political influence operating in the name of the national defense to defeat the national purpose to avoid war and provocations of war—and nullify the international efforts to restrict and supervise the manufacture and sale of arms and implements of war—nothing has been done by the United States Government, as yet, to give effect to its findings and recommendations. In particular, despite efforts during the last ten years in both houses of Congress, little has been accomplished to impose effective embargoes against the exportation of arms and implements of war to nations threatening war or engaged in armed hostilities in plain violation of the Kellogg Pact.

Believing that delay now threatens disaster, and that the time to act is in time of peace, to establish an unequivocal muntions-policy, expanding and re-enforcing the traditional American doctrine and law of neutrality, and implementing the Kellogg Pact, we ask that the following steps should be taken at once by the Administration and the Congress, acting together for the national interest, to prevent a repetition of the blunders of 1917 and to insure that the United States shall exert its just influence against war in the world:

1. Declare the policy of the United States, make unlawful, and prohibit, the exportation of arms and unqualified munitions of war, directly or indirectly, and the extending of commercial credits or loans of money, to all nations engaged in war or armed hostilities, in violation of the Kellogg Pact, whenever the President recognizes the existence of such hostilities by proclaiming the neutrality of the United States. This prohibition to endure as long as the conflict or the hostilities continue. (As proposed by the Munitions Committee of the Senate and the Kloeb Bill, on the calendar of the House.)*

2. Call upon all other signatories of the Kellogg-Briand Pact to join with the United States in a supplementary multilateral Pact, establishing the foregoing policy as a general principle of developing international law against war, (as proposed by Senator Borah, and by the Fish Bill, which has been pending before the House of Representatives' Committee on Foreign Affairs, since 1930).

3. Restrain American citizens from enlisting in the armed forces of any foreign state engaged in war or armed hostilities, or threatening them, and enforce the language of George Washington's enlightened proclamation of Neutrality, "enjoining the citizens of the United States against "committing, aiding or abetting hostilities against any of the . . . powers at war, *or carrying to any of them those articles which are deemed contraband by the modern usage of nations.*" (Note: The Neutrality Law does prohibit enlistment in foreign armies engaged in war, and also taking passage on belligerent merchant ships.)

4. Invite to Washington a conference of representatives of all states signatory of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, for the purpose of concluding a new multilateral convention, redefining the law of neutrality and the duties of neutrals, in the light of modern conditions of warfare, and establishing a regime of national and international restriction and supervision of private and state manufacture of, and of international traffic in, arms, munitions and inplements of war, as proposed by the delegates of the United States to the abortive Disarmament Conference at Geneva, in 1932 (Signed) HAMILTON FISH, JR.

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

*Note: A part of this has been done by the new Neutrality Bill. Loans were not included in the prohibition.

The Basic Principles of Adult Education

Now for a number of years a movement known as adult education has commanded the attention of enlightened educators and is rapidly becoming the concern of intelligent leaders in many walks of life, including the governmental.

Back of this present interest is a long period of similar, but by no means identical, activities such as removing illiteracy, Americanization, lyceums, chautauquas, university extension, labor schools, forums, discussion and study groups, conferences, and unorganized conversation.

In most of these older adult activities the dissemination of information was dominant, although some attention was given to cooperative learning and creative thinking.

We have now reached the point in education, both formal and informal, where the acquiring of knowledge is recognized as of far less importance than the expansion of intelligence.

Since life situations are always changing and new situations arising, it is important to be able to meet them with quickened intelligence and flexible skills, rather than with massive information that is no longer pertinent.

Moreover, education in terms of the joy of living freely and creatively from the earliest school days on through life is now dominant over the old idea of education as preparation for life. In other words, school days are never over for intelligent people.

Formal education itself is undergoing rapid change in both content and method, and the barriers between the campus and the world are breaking down. How far this process goes and how effective the schools become in the larger movement for universal adult education depends now more on the attitude and the program of adult education leaders than on the formal agencies, because the formal agencies are increasingly willing to expand to whatever proportions new situations and needs require.

There should be no warfare between formal and informal education. Formal education is becoming more informal, and informal education would benefit by becoming a little more formal.

The adult education movement should now rethink its program in terms of its basic purposes and so be in a position to use to the best advantage the resources of the formal agencies. The use of college professors for occasional debates, panel discussions, and symposiums, is not enough. The philosophy and the techniques of adult education must be integrated, and the whole program of learning and enlightenment made one life process. But this is a subject for special consideration. My present purpose is to state briefly what seem to me to be the basic purposes of adult education.

I. The first and most obvious purpose of adult education is the prolongation of the period of education, making it co-extensive with the period of life. Commencement properly so-called is not at the end of the college course but at the beginning of the first breath of life—not to say earlier! And graduation never comes—not even at the tomb! If one is alert, one is always learning.

We need to stress the importance of a prolonged educational process from the point of view of the sheer joy of learning, as well as that of the need to keep the mind supple for effective action. We need to propagandize the gala aspects of education—learning not even for the learning itself, but for the hilarity that comes

with the opening of the mind to new knowledge, new ideas, new skills, and new imaginings!

It is of course well known that some of the dullest dullards are persons who closed their minds on the day of graduation and have never opened them since. For sheer dogmatism and narrowness these are surpassed only by the person who once read a book—and swallowed it leaf by leaf! To keep the mind alert and skills active, one must be a perpetual learner. To this end classrooms and lecture halls may be useful, but cannot take the place of habitual learning in ordinary situations.

II. One of the most important purposes of adult education is to meet the felt need of adults for more ease and greater release in life's experiences. This felt need results from the awareness of the lack of formal education, and when so caused is met only by the awareness of the possibilities of self education. This need results also for those who have a formal education but are aware that they have not kept abreast of the general advance of knowledge, nor of developments in their own field.

Occasionally one finds a person who is so blissfully unaware of his ignorance that he is at perfect ease in almost any situation and whose unconscious techniques of release are little short of a fine art. One would almost hesitate to disillusion such a person. But for the common run of humanity, in both educated and uneducated circles, there is a constant nervous strain due to the consciousness of inadequacy in both knowledge and skills. It is the aim of adult education to meet this felt need by supplying both personal and group opportunities for the extension and modernization of knowledge, the exercise of skills, the free interplay of minds in discussion, and the development of the sense of power that comes with the consciousness of something well done.

III. I take it to be a chief purpose of adult education to teach people *how* to learn and, within certain limitations, *what* to learn. All authorities in adult education agree in stressing the primary importance of the process of learning, starting with a felt need or the awareness of a problem, and moving through observation and experiment to tentative conclusions and on to verification and still further tests in the laboratory of life's experiences.

But not all agree with the emphasis I am here placing on *what* to learn. It is true that stress on *what* to learn can be very easily overdone and that the hazards of dogmatism hover close by, ready to seize the mind and fix it on a single *what*. Moreover, this places a grave responsibility on leaders of adult education and perhaps even more on those who select the leaders. I have known great harm to come to active and venturesome minds by being headed up the blind alleys of the intellectual underworld.

Being fully aware by both experience and observation of the dangers involved, I nevertheless hold that the process of learning cannot operate in a vacuum; and that the meeting of a felt need or the solving of a problem cannot be effectively done, nor is this psychologically possible, without pre-suppositions and a body of knowledge. The real danger comes in holding the presuppositions as final and the body of knowledge as fixed. Valid learning depends on valid purposes and valid knowledge. One could hardly call a process educational in a situation where no distinction is made between the validity of alchemy and chemistry, or astrology and astronomy, or for that matter between autocracy and democracy. Once admit this and the road is open for an intelligent fusing of *how* to learn with *what* to learn.

IV. By common consent adult education aims to develop a collective wisdom that is not mere crowd-mindedness and is more than the mere sum of individual opinions.

In free society it is especially needful for us to learn that neither the bias of individuals nor the mind of the mob is a sufficient guide through the troublous ways of the modern world. Both are unscientific and frequently tyrannous. Not even our techniques of compromise, much less our boasted majority rule, are sufficient for our needs. We must learn how to arrive at a consensus that is understood and appreciated, not a victory or a compromise that is tolerated.

The truth is that the pooling of information and experience actually reduces antagonisms and produces higher levels of personal thinking, and that this process is essential in a society where shared activities are necessary. There is no master mind in an ivory tower. Master mentality comes from the clash of minds in the grapple with facts in actual situations—if it comes at all.

V. A final purpose of adult education is the channeling of behavior to the end that personality may be expanded and the social estate enriched.

This purpose should be more consciously held in the field of informal adult education than in the field of formal education, although I do not see how it can be escaped in either—nor do I believe it should be escaped. We are to a considerable extent motor beings and we behave as we do largely because somewhere action patterns were formed. The trouble is that action patterns have been formed accidentally, or foisted upon us for ulterior motives. It would certainly be no criticism of intelligent action to say that it had become habitual. The motive of enlarging personality and enriching the social order needs no defense. In a world of maladjusted persons and world situations unworthy of being adjusted to, we need to bring our total educational resources—formal and informal—to bear upon immediate needs and far-reaching changes.

Adult education stands at the cross roads. It may become a fad and a failure, or it may become integrated into our general educational program as a recognized and effective method of quickening minds, perfecting skills, fostering diversity and uniqueness in a social whole, and so be a worthy means in the building of a better world. It is the high duty of all who are engaged in the field of adult education to keep the movement broad, yet purposeful; informal, yet pedagogically sound.

CURTIS W. REESE.

We think of our land and water and human resources not as static and sterile possessions but as life-giving assets to be directed by wise provision for future days. We seek to use our natural resources, not as a thing apart but as something that is interwoven with industry, labor, finance, taxation, agriculture, recreation, homes, good citizenship. The result of this interweaving will have a greater influence on the future of American standards of living than all the rest of our economics put together.—*From Franklin D. Roosevelt's Message to Congress.*

Antiquated Laws and Their Outgrown Usefulness

A distinguished law professor recently said that "perhaps the commonest and most universally held idea is that there is altogether too much legislation in this country; that the quantity of legislative grist turned out by our legislative mills is monstrous in amount and far exceeds the limits of what is necessary or desirable."* Something like 20,000 statutes are passed every two years by the legislatures of our forty-eight states.

Perhaps it might be suggested that the danger of clogging the legislative machine as a means of public service might be less real if we were to sift the Code once in a while and weed out what laws are never enforced because out of date, inadequate, useless or ridiculous.

Especially is this true with the Criminal Statutes. When those acts which the average person might occasionally be guilty of without offending public convenience, decency or morals, are classified as criminal acts in the Penal Code, for which punishment may be meted out by imprisonment up to three years, then it is time for us to sift the Criminal Statutes and omit such laws for the good of society.

The experience we have had with Prohibition sufficiently taught us that nothing is so conducive of lawlessness as to have statutes on the books that are not enforced or statutes that run against the emotional grain of the community. And yet there are at least 49 statutes—criminal statutes of New York that I could name—that if the District Attorney would ever attempt to enforce the public ridicule that it would bring down on him would seriously affect the efficiency of his office. Consider and judge for yourselves if this be an exaggeration when I tell you that riding a bicycle on a sidewalk or waypath constitutes a misdemeanor and as such punishable by imprisonment up to three years.

It is a crime under section 2030 to purchase land of an Indian in New York State. It is a crime to appropriate to one's own use any lost treasure or any waived property belonging to the state by virtue of its sovereignty. These laws remind one of the farmer who locked his stable after the horse was gone. Betting on a prize fight is a misdemeanor according to section 1712, and any person who leaves the State with intent of evading the prize fight law, is guilty of a misdemeanor according to sections 1713-14. Apparently the Legislature is not content with legislating for New Yorkers only in New York. According to section 2145 any person who commits the crime of Sabbath breaking: who goes fishing, hunting, or partakes of any sport or exercise on Sunday, is guilty of a crime, the only exception to that is baseball. If you give away a transfer of a street railway company you are guilty of a misdemeanor and may be prosecuted. If you engage or partake in any theatrical performance on Sunday you are punishable for a crime. According to section 2149 any person who exposes articles or commodities for sale on Sunday, not only is punishable under the Sabbath breaking section of the Penal Law, but forfeits such articles and commodities and which must be sold on one day's notice, and the proceeds paid to the overseer of the poor. Under section 2151 if you join in any parade on Sunday, except a funeral or military procession, you are guilty of a crime and become subject to fine and imprisonment.

If you race a horse within a mile of a courthouse, you are liable to be imprisoned under section 1080. If you happen to dispose of farm goods and take a note in part payment and give the note to your wife or a friend, both you, your wife, or your friend, could be convicted of a crime, for under section 1521 it is a misdemeanor to handle any note for which the consideration is such speculation. If you happen to be caught in a rain and take shelter under a stranger's roof, you might be accused of overhearing conversation and jailed under section 721.

If you should engage in any religious discussion which may amount to persuasion you are liable to be guilty under section 2073. Under that section the Salvation Army might be construed to be violating the law for the Salvation Army clearly attempts to compel persons to adopt a religious belief. Similarly it is a crime to represent the Divine Person on the stage in any form. Under this law the Passion Play, which graced the stage a few years ago, and which thrilled audiences with its moral and dramatic power, should have been prohibited and the performers punished for a crime.

Numerous other illustrations might be mentioned of laws that are obsolete, out of date, or contrary to the emotional acceptance of the community. If you leave the State you might be charged and convicted of an attempt to evade the anti-dueling law which is still on the statute books, though dueling, among us, is completely a thing of the past. According to section 1899 a person who advises or induces an employee of a railway company not to wear a uniform or who induces such employee to go into the service of another railway company, is guilty of a misdemeanor. Section 100 to 103, making adultery a crime, should be repealed in my opinion, for the simple reason that it is not enforced. Hundreds of divorces are obtained every week in New York State on the ground of adultery, but no attempt is ever made to prosecute the parties so adjudged guilty. Laws have no place in the Criminal Code which may be enforced only in the exception but not in rule.

Massachusetts still has some laws on its statute books that harken back to the days of witchcraft prosecution. Blasphemy is defined to be a crime under the Criminal Law—whoever reproaches God or "His creation government" is punishable by imprisonment of one year. Under a strict construction of this statute any dissenter or critic of government might be safely lodged in the penintentiary. Cursing or swearing is made a crime by statute. To play billiards for money, even in your own home, is criminal. To sell to a minor a detective story magazine is criminal. To discharge a firearm while engaged in any sport on Sunday is criminal, and to be present at any play, game, or sport on Sunday, except under certain restrictive exceptions, is punishable as a crime.

The danger of having obsolete laws as criminal statutes is more real than apparent. Laws must be respected to be enforced, and enforced to be respected. When a law ceases to have public approval so that its enforcement becomes a dead letter, it is best that it be repealed. In comparatively recent years the State of New Jersey repealed 1,248 laws. That New York is exceedingly backward in repealing laws which have outlived their usefulness can be seen from the fact that

*Prof. John Dickinson of University of Pennsylvania article on "Legislation and Enforcement." American Bar Association Journal.

the Fugitive Slave Law, enacted in the days before the Civil War, was not repealed until 1932.

Another danger of having useless, antiquated and socially untenable criminal laws, which however may be invoked at any time, is the arbitrary power which it gives to the public prosecutor. Of course there are two views to the question of the function of the Criminal Code and the function of the prosecutor's office. One view is that it is the duty of the prosecuting attorney to enforce all laws regardless of his own judgment of public convenience or safety. According to this view laws unenforced lead to disrespect for law and to unenforcement of law generally. To avoid this result it follows that rather than have unenforceable laws breed disrespect for all law, that unenforceable laws be repealed.

The opposing view on this problem is that it is the duty of the prosecuting attorney to solve the problem of public order and safety, using the criminal code as an instrument rather than a set of laws. This makes it proper that some laws should be enforced, others occasionally enforced, and others ignored according to the best judgment of the enforcing authority. According to this view obsolete laws serve a purpose like antiquated weapons which may be used only in case of social necessity. It cannot however be denied that this view is subversive of the underlying principles of democratic government and the basic principle of justice which is equality before the law. In the hands of an unscrupulous or corrupt prosecuting attorney the liberty of indulging in discriminations in the enforcement of the criminal code, might be used as an instrument of oppression and for personal or party ends.

"The idea," says Professor Thornton Arnold of Yale University, "that a prosecuting attorney should be permitted to use discretion concerning the laws which he will enforce and those which he will disregard, appears to the ordinary citizen to border on anarchy . . . this power of the prosecution today to dig up obsolete laws, or to use laws, such as the income tax law, to accomplish an entirely different result, may be viewed with alarm."†

Those of us who still look to the Constitution and the fundamental laws as the guaranty of our liberties will hesitate to delegate those guaranties to the discretion of any prosecuting attorney, no matter how wise or gracious he may be. In that event we should insist that whatever in the Criminal Code is out of date, obsolete, or may prove a danger to our liberties, should be repealed and not be permitted to fetter the body politics long after they have outgrown their usefulness. Attorney General Cummings, in addressing the American Bar Association, said: "to my mind the law is not a mere body of precedent. I visualize it as a living, vital, growing thing, fashioned for service and constantly being refreshened for further service."*

ISIDORE A. BLANCH.

†Prof. Thornton W. Arnold, Article on Law Enforcement, Yale Law Journal, November, 1932.

*Address of Homer Cummings, Attorney General of United States, before American Bar Association, "Modern Tendencies in the Law." American Bar Association Journal, January 13, 1934.

The Study Table

The Menace of Rome

Dr. Barrett, ex-Jesuit, is widely and favorably known as the author of "The Jesuit Enigma" and "While Peter Sleeps." His "Magnificent Illusion" remains one of the most fascinating autobiographies of our time. This latest book,* interesting and ably written, like its predecessors, is a study of the Roman Catholic renaissance in America, and its purpose and ambition.

Dr. Barrett's thesis is the familiar charge that Rome is proposing to capture Washington. As presented in this book, it is something far more stern and serious than the hoary slander against the Holy Church. The author points to the undoubted fact, which he substantiates by abundant evidence, that the Roman Catholic Church in this country is an enormously powerful institution, which today is virile, aggressive, and in many ways triumphant. It is led by the Pope himself, Pius XI, whom Dr. Barrett describes as one of the greatest men who ever sat in the chair of Peter. The Holy Father, while pushing the cause of the Church vigorously in all parts of the world, sees clearly that its real future lies in America. He has set out deliberately, therefore, to subdue this country to the rule of Rome, and is succeeding beyond the apprehension of any of its citizens outside of the hierarchy itself. His campaign is seen in the various phases of the Catholic Action movement, which our author finds amazingly and dreadfully successful. Dr. Barrett deplores the whole modern tendency of the Church—first, because it means the betrayal of Christianity's true spiritual mission, and secondly, because it means a direct and perhaps fatal attack upon American democracy. The present situation, as he sees it, involves "an immediate threat to the present order in America."

If we wanted to ridicule this book, we could lightly describe it as the latest of the long list of books written to "throw a scare" into the American people by telling tall tales about the Scarlet Woman. But Dr. Barrett is too able and sincere, and the mass of evidence he presents is too impressive, to allow of any such easy indictment. What he says about the Catholic Church in Boston, and the alliance of the Church in New York with Tammany Hall, is too serious to be ignored. His pen-pictures of Cardinal O'Connell, champion of the *status quo*, and of Father Coughlin, Fascist agitator, may well give us pause. His "Strange Case of Father Norman," if true as stated, is as frightful as it is "strange." The chapters on Mexico, "the fight against Birth Control," the Legion of Decency, the Church's relation to Communism and to politics generally, are all arresting. Yet must we confess that, in the end, the book leaves us cold.

What we seem to find here is abundant evidence of the existence of a great historic church, convinced of its divine mission, awakened to fresh activity by able leadership, and now determined to use the opportunity granted by American liberty to commend itself to the American people and to advance its cause among them. Certain disturbing episodes one side, we cannot see that the Catholic Church is doing anything other than what any church, or institution, would do, and actually is doing, in its own legitimate interest. The Catholic Action campaign reminds us of nothing so much as the

*"Rome Stoops to Conquer," by E. Boyd Barrett. Published by Julian Messner, Inc. New York. $2.75.

Evangelical "Men and Religion Forward Movement" of some years ago. The Legion of Decency was sustained not only by Catholics but also by Protestants and Jews. The story told at length in these pages of the advancement of the interests of the Catholic press by appeals in the churches could be duplicated tenfold in the Protestant churches. Cardinal O'Connell is simply an Irish Catholic replica of Bishop Manning. Father Coughlin had his keenest rival in the perfectly sound, Bible-quoting, orthodox Protestant, Huey Long. Even Father Norman could find Protestant clergymen who have suffered at the hands of their ecclesiastical superiors in ways not altogether dissimilar to his experience.

Yes, it's a sad story! But granted everything that Dr. Barrett says, and honestly says, we still do not see any reason for rushing to the hypothesis of a Roman Catholic conspiracy against the free institutions of this republic. Under our laws and customs, any church or other private institution is entirely free to push its interests and defend its cause as vigorously as possible. The worst that can be said of Romanism, the most that Dr. Barrett says, it seems to us, is that the Church is taking full and very able advantage of the opportunity we give her in this country. If the Church, as he thinks, is in teaching and practice subversive of the best interests of our American life, then it is for us to protect ourselves by truer teaching and nobler practice. To this we see no alternative but interference by government and official suppression of the Church. But this would be instant death of everything we hold dear! We have no trust but in liberty itself, and that we hold sufficient. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Re-organization of the Government of the United States of America*

I

It is one of the most hopeful signs regarding the future of the great republic of the United States of America, that many persons representing interests of different groups holding divergent political creeds, are thinking about the needed change in the government of the United States and its administration. Advocates of radical changes in the government of the United States—such as American Fascists and Communists—are too vocal and they preach the idea that democracies are doomed forever and that the only hope lies in adopting a type of government which will be "class rule" and "dictatorship," discarding the ideals of the existing Constitution. But there are thoughtful Americans who believe that the fundamentals underlying the Constitution of U. S. A. which champions human liberty should be upheld to preserve the achievements of many centuries. People belonging to the latter group, are not agitators but believers in American Freedom. Some of them are convinced that liberty in the United States might be endangered by the activities of reactionaries as well as radicals. There are indications that some of these Americans who prize their birth-right of "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" are anxious to take active measures to rouse the thinking public of the country, so that some needed change in the American Government may be brought about without a Revolution.

*"Common Sense in Government" (Ideas and Suggestions), by Carl Schilling (published by the author), 911 Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills, California.

II

Mr. Carl Schilling, an old graduate of the University of California, a man of vast experience in world affairs, a retired businessman of San Francisco and Los Angeles, has taken upon his shoulders the responsibilities of an American citizen to express his views on the subject of re-organization of the Government of the United States, in neatly printed three small volumes entitled "Common Sense in Government." These booklets cover only 216 pages. They are printed by the author at his own expense for distribution among American citizens, asking for their views on various phases of American Government and the needed changes.

The author is a believer in a true and efficient democracy, in which the real power must rest with intelligent people, consciously partaking in formulating governmental policies and checking up the workings of the governmental department. Mr. Schilling holds what is wrong with the United States Government, is that "a good government is being unwisely operated" (p. 202). The Government of the United States should be run on a business principle which will benefit its share-holders. Every citizen of the United States is a share-holder in this great enterprise of the United States Government whose primary object is to further the welfare and happiness of the people. No business, even a vast corporation with tremendous resources, can maintain its soundness if its directors continue to follow a policy of unrestricted spending. Unless the government of the United States adopts a policy of running it "on the basis of pay as you go" there is serious trouble for the people of this country. Mr. Schilling is old-fashioned in his conception of honesty in business and maintenance of contract. Therefore he is very much opposed to any form of financial tinkering which undermines the fundamental idea of honoring an honest debt on the part of a corporation or a government. The United States must pay her honest debts; but it at the same time must adopt a policy which will ensure that there will be no new debts piling up. He is drastic in his suggestions regarding the financial reform to the extent that the government should not be in the lending and borrowing business and should refrain from issuing new bonds. His idea is very simple and logical. He suggests that the United States Government should raise certain sums of money by taxation which must cover the necessary expenses of the Government. It may be said that he suggests that the Government must not spend more than its income in the form of taxation.

He presents a very novel and interesting form of taxation which cannot be fully discussed in this article; but which is based upon the idea of the much-advocated "sales tax" on graduated basis. When the manufacturers purchase raw materials, they should pay a *very low* percentage of sales tax; so that business will not be burdened with unnecessary and heavy cost of production. Then he suggests that all commodities should be classified under (a) Necessities (b) Comforts (c) Lux-Comforts (d) Luxuries and (e) Super-Luxuries. Then he suggests that *"the necessities of life should not be taxed."* Tax on comfort will be 3%; we should tax luxury comforts 8%, and the luxuries 16%. Superluxuries however can be taxed 40% (p. 89). While opposed to any form of Income Tax, Mr. Schilling suggests a graduated system of *"Excess Assets Tax."* His argument is that when a man pays various types of sales tax, his income should be free from other kind of

taxes; but if he saves and by some process increases his *"assets,"* he should pay a graduated tax on this increase. This "Excess Assets Tax" begins with 2½% per thousand dollars to 65% for a million dollars and upwards. Many people may not agree with the author's ideas on taxation, but his arguments are ingenious and interesting and workable, although it may be regarded as revolutionary. (pp. 77-105.)

Mr. Schilling is opposed to any form of strike, which is wasteful and suggests that all forms of strike should be outlawed. He at the same time demands enforcement of minimum wage for various industries, after careful research by experts. All labor disputes must be adjusted by the expert officials of the Department of Labor and their decisions will be binding to employees and employers as well.

Alien agitators and those who advocate overthrow of the government of the United States should be deported. In fact Mr. Schilling suggests that no alien who cannot produce a clean police record of his land of birth should be admitted into the United States. All aliens as well as citizens must be registered with the local police for identification. Aliens who within two years after immigrating into the United States do not wish to become citizens of the United States should leave the country. Citizens of the United States will always have the preference over aliens regarding employment.

After finishing their High School education, every citizen of the United States must undergo military training for national defense. Even young women should have some form of training regarding the problems of nursing and national health. No man or woman who has not given his or her services to the cause of national defense will be allowed to get a governmental position or any kind of employment. Mr. Schilling is not a militarist, but he believes that every nation should take the necessary precaution for National Defense. He does not believe in a large Standing Army. He advocates a system of "Service Army" which may be well compared with the Swiss Regular Army, to be supported by well-trained citizens who can be impressed into national service, in case of necessity. By this method, military expenditure will be reduced and there will be an up-to-date and efficient National Defense force. The United States should have a strong well-equipped Navy for National Defense. Mr. Schilling however advocates that the United States Government will not have the power to declare war against any nation, without a national vote on the subject. He believes that the people will be willing to fight to defend the country; but they will refuse to enter into war just to satisfy the whims of politicians and others.

Mr. Schilling feels that the United States Diplomatic Service is ill-equipped for the most important business of maintaining international relations and he suggests a method of over-hauling the State Department, from the Secretary of State to a consular officer, on the basis of efficiency and experience, freed from all forms of political influence. He suggests that the United States Government should establish Chairs of International Relations and Diplomacy at least in five different universities in various parts of the country. The course of studies should cover full four years and all phases of consular and diplomatic service. The successful students should be given United States Government appointment. First of all they should serve as clerks for two years to master official routines. These clerks should be promoted to vice-consuls, consuls, consul-generals, ministers, etc., just as in the Army and Navy, graduates of West Point and Annapolis are promoted through various grades. No politician will ever be appointed as minister and ambassador, as is now being done. No one will be able to serve as the secretary of state unless he has had some ambassadorial experience. It would mean that a secretary of state will be a man who has worked his way up from a clerk, vice-consul, consul, consul-general, legation attache, minister, ambassador to the position of great responsibility. Similarly the secretary of war must be a major general or a man of such training and the secretary of navy must be an admiral, all Cabinet positions must be filled by experts and not politicians and job-grabbers.

Regarding the re-organization of the Government of the United States, Mr. Schilling proposes that the number of the Members of the Senate and the House of Governors (in place of House of Representatives) should be only 50 persons. They will have definite law-making power; but occasionally the people will have the power of using referendum to approve laws. In this connection, Mr. Schilling suggests certain restrictions regarding voting power and compulsory and periodical broad-casting by the Government regarding legislation and other governmental activities to the people who will thus be able to intelligently use their voting power at the time of referendum.

Regarding the solution of the crime problem, Mr. Schilling suggests that all manufacturing of arms and ammunition for national defense must be under the control of the Government and it must not be allowed to be carried on by private corporations. This will help the cause of international peace. Similarly no citizen should be allowed to possess revolvers and machine guns. The officers of the United States will have arms to protect the citizens from criminals who must not be allowed to possess any arms. Then he suggests that steps should be taken to curb the activities of criminal lawyers. All criminals should have the privilege of using legal aid for their defense, but they will have to choose a lawyer from a group of five suggested by the court. Then there should be no parole and pardoning of criminals by politicians. Mentally defective criminals should be given necessary medical treatment; but criminals must not be let loose upon society. Mr. Schilling goes further saying that mental defectives and criminals should not be allowed to propagate, thus marriage laws must be made uniform for the United States and should be for the purpose of propagating a healthy race.

These are some of the interesting suggestions of a businessman, an American who is for peace and the welfare of the people and at the same time advocates some changes in the form of the administration of the Government of the United States. Mr. Schilling has in his booklets discussed thirty-seven different necessary requisites for a good government and then has given his views on the following topics: 1. The Presidency; 2. Congress; 3. The Senate; 4. The House of Governors; 5. The Cabinet; 6. Taxation; 7. Voting Privileges; 8. Aliens and Immigrants; 9. The Army; 10. The Navy; 11. The Service Army; 12. Marriages; 13. War; 14. Strikes and Unions, Minimum Wage and Child Labor; 15. Firearms; 16. Criminal Lawyers; 17. The Mechanics of Voting; 18. The Diplomatic Corps; 19. Pardons and Paroles.

The merits of the work are that these subjects have been discussed in such a simple manner that a man in

the street will be able to understand them. The author does not believe that all his ideas will be acceptable to the people of the United States. But he believes that this discussion may serve as a basis for investigation and common action on the part of those Americans who believe in democratic form of government and at the same time feel that there should be certain changes in the Government of the United States to meet the demands of the present-day society. Mr. Schilling's work on "Common Sense in Government" contains some very valuable suggestions for those who believe in governmental reform and not revolution. The Fascists and Communists will not like Mr. Schilling's work, but liberals and true democrats may be heartened by it.

TARAKNATH DAS.

The Prince of Romance*

And then I dream on Francis, that first time,
And that long festal year at Fontainbleau,

sings Browning, prince of poets, through the lips of Andrea del Sarto, prince of painters, crowning a Victorian renaissance—the dual invocation may stand sponsor, if ironically, to Mr. Hackett's rousing resurgence for Francis I, prince of romance, pride and glory of a greater Renaissance, wastrel of a world, Maecenus of letters in an age surpassing Hellenism, his satyr-like soul curiously inwrought with beauty and lust, fairness and treachery, vice and *virtu,* evil and holiness. Type and symbol of his age, he now takes bow at beck of a most accomplished magician (no less person than the prestidigitator of *Henry VIII*): without tedium to either writer or reader, his career across those glamorous vistas may be followed throughout these lines with honorable brevity—as we intend to follow it.

Opening with a rather Rabelaisian fanfare for Francis, type eternal of all soldier-scamps in history, our dramatist swiftly assembles his background, Europe in the rich riotous sixteenth century; and then, without further palaver, plunges his fantastic Caesar over against it, the narrative pageant which accompanies foaming and boiling on its way with true Pantagruelian frenzy. Fond fruit of a frigid dynastic marriage, spoiled hopelessly at Amboise by his widowed mother, Louise of Savoy, and his adoring sister Marguerite, Francis of Angouleme leaped upon the French throne in 1500 with true Renaissance gusto, and set out at once on his career of conquest—a career which led across the Alps to Marignano and glory, through his titanic joust with Charles V for the crown of the Caesars, culminating in Pavia and catastrophe; finally smouldering out during almost half a century of internecine strife, as a result of which much of Europe was laid waste, and Europe's vainglorious kings lorded it over a crimson shambles above which hovered like some fantastic exhalation from a field of rotting corpses, the *Zeit Geist* of rapine, waxing ever in ghastly luminescence from the golden trappings of the dead. Thus the martial side of Francis' career—and, like most of his peers, it displays him as a good sixteenth (or twentieth) century warlord, i. e., a monster of ambition and self indulgence, casting away a kingdom for a coin, drenching himself in the blood of his subjects with light-hearted glee, driven at last by his reckless audacity into defending what he had so thoughtlessly jeopardized, and assuming the heroic mantle as guardian of his fatherland. Concerning his affairs with women, they are legion, and bestow upon him uncontested the amorous side of our caption. An old wives' tale, too trite to need emphasis: Francis as Warlord; but there is yet another portion of that complex character which needs stressing—Francis as Patron of Art and Letters: a note upon which we began, and, this bloody interlude notwithstanding, upon which we expect to close, if only to prove that Antony's maxim concerning the mortality of what men do, though sonorous as to sound, is often obviated in actuality.

For, in and out of this drama of war, chivalry, bloodshed, violence, and wholesale destruction, runs like a minor theme in accompaniment, the spirit of Renaissance art, incarnate in this strange compound of contradictions. Leonardo da Vinci, Clement Marot, Jean Clouet, Andrea del Sarto, Benvenuto Cellini—these are but a few of the mighty maestros whom he patronized and appreciated, *arbiter elegantarum* as he was of all who did things excellent and beautiful: Chambord, Blois, Amboise, and the unforgettable Fontainbleau—these, together with innumerable smaller *objets d'art* (for this prince virtually lived on cloth of gold), survive as eloquent testimony to their master's creative stimulus and its definitive satisfaction. Then there is the College de France, and the work of Bude and Guillaume Postel in discovering and preserving knowledge in the form of olden manuscripts. All these, plus his patronage of Rabelais, comprise a roster of artistic endeavor scarcely to be matched elsewhere in the Renaissance: and the whole may perhaps be sufficient to redeem with posterity the name of a man who otherwise would stand supreme amongst buccaneers of empire and insensate destroyers of human happiness.

A blinding, blazing Renaissance pageant, this latest work of Francis Hackett, more restraind than *Henry VIII,* better woven together by far—so intense is its splendor, with all the glories of an overwrought age lavished upon it; so multitudinous is its cast, comprising, as but a few of its myriads, Villon, Charles d'Orleans, Louis XI, Cesare Borgia, Alexander VI, Columbus, Lorenzo the Magnificent, Bayard, Leonardo, Raphael, Michelangelo, Cellini, Henry VIII, Charles V, Luther, Maximillien, Ludovico Sforza, Bourbon, Marguerite, sister of Francis I, Henry II, his successor, Constable Montmorency, Anne of Brittany, Bonnivet,—in short, so many faceted is the work, that we can only praise and pass on, after a final glance at its protagonist.

At the moment of his death, between earth and elsewhere, Mr. Hackett poises him for passing: "a wicked old satyr gone to seed," "never a prig," "an animal, a great healthy animal in his vigor," "ravished by the art of Lenardo . . . Grolier . . . Clouet": a "tolerant and practiced human being, without iron prejudices," yet "a member of an iron cast, soldiering," "a friend to no one"—he stands at the gates of the Renaissance, "shimmering in glory." Another bar of quotation from a most admirable work; and we are done:

> Three coffins were borne to St. Denis, his own, that of his boy Francois, that of Charles. The Valois would march on with the dark Henri. They would march down and down until at last, in abysmal night, the benign spirit of Marguerite would rescue the tribe through her grandson Henri Quatre. She would redeem the race, as so often she had redeemed her brother.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

*Francis I. By Francis Hackett. Published by Doubleday, Doran, 1935. $3.00.

Correspondence

Italy's African Colonies Now Sufficient for Her

Editor of UNITY:

American tourists returning from Italy mention the relative frankness of the Italian people in regard to the Ethiopian trouble, and look on it with a certain degree of favor. They say, Italy needs room for expansion for her surplus population. She has not the requisite room in Europe. The only place where she may find space is in Africa. Since Ethiopia lies in her path, she must seize Ethiopia to make room for herself to live. This argument the Americans have swallowed whole, and so have the equally misguided Italians. Because of this falsehood, tens of thousands who might otherwise hesitate, will send their sons to worse than death in the African jungles, never dreaming that they are being sacrificed to satisfy the ego of one individual, and to hide the faults of his sinister administration.

What are the facts in regard to the Italian colonies in Africa?

Italy has four great colonies there already. Eritrea, Italian Somaliland, Tripolitania and Cyrenaica. These total in area 875,485 square miles. This is about nine times the size of Italy and nearly three times the size of Ethiopia. The population of these colonies is 2,369,254, which is about three to the square mile. Italy has 344 to the square mile. The European population of Eritrea is 3600, of Italian Somaliland is 1658, of Tripolitania 29,749 and of Cyrenaica 19,000. If Italy really wants to expand, all she needs to do is to increase the population of these four colonies to 50 to the square mile and there will be no one left in all of Italy.

In these four undeveloped Italian colonies there are gold mines. There is oil and petroleum. Cotton can be raised and grain. There is room for any form of agriculture, of animal husbandry and grazing. Italian Somaliland has a magnificent coast line 1100 miles in length fronting on the Indian ocean, fit to be developed for commerce. Tripolitania and Cyrenaica have palm orchards, olive groves, lemon, almond and fig trees. They have vineyards in plenty and room for many more. In addition, small grains of every kind may be grown.

If, in the face of these easily available facts, the Italian dictator still wants additional room of expansion, let him fill up the Italian quota to America, which has room to spare.

The facts are, however, that Italians happen to love Italy, and do not want to go either to Africa or anywhere else. When they finally find out the truth about the entire campaign against Ethiopia, after they have counted the cost, somebody will have to pay.

S. H. WALDSTEIN.

Brookline, Mass.

Equality of Opportunity

Editor of UNITY:

Anticipating the national election British women of the Liberal party present their claims for social justice, in a circular published by the Women's National Liberal Federation, 42 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. It shows that they adhere to the old traditions of Asquith and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, that the settlement of the land question is the first thing to be attempted; the taxation of land values, carried out to its logical conclusion, will put an end to the crime of poverty that disgraces each civilized nation at present. *Equality of opportunity* will come through breaking up land monopoly, and the governments that are wise enough to make a beginning by taking the fabulous rent of land now going into private hands, and thus remitting all present taxes, will be on the honor roll of an appreciative posterity. These British women speak with their well-thought-out belief of the impossibility of any lasting benefit coming from all the efforts being made by the various nations at present. It would be something really practical if our Progressive women would study and follow the lead of the British. The circular says:

> The Liberal Party would Tax Land Values and so grapple with Unemployment and Housing. Liberalism does mean Equality of Opportunity and Social Justice . . . Instead of merely looking at and sighing over the monthly unemployment returns, Liberals would make an effort to grapple with the greatest problem that ever faced us as a nation. The longer unemployment goes on, the more we are inclined to regard it as something inevitable. Unemployment is not inevitable, if only the Liberals secured a majority to tackle the land question. Land monopoly is not the only one that exists, but it is by far the greatest of all monopolies—it is perpetual—and is the mother of all other forms of monopoly. The first step in getting rid of this perpetual monopoly is by means of a tax on site values—all land whether used or not. This tax taking its place as the source of public revenues of taxes and rates now levied on houses, shops, factories and all forms of improvements. . . . There is no confiscation of the efforts of men's hands and brains in these Liberal proposals. We demand that our towns have freedom to use the land they need and to secure the values they alone create. . . Employment, national development, factories, shops, houses, roads, drainage, afforestation, water supplies, coal and other minerals, agriculture—*all demand the use of land.*

WINIFRED B. COSSETTE.

Cambridge, Mass.

"If This Be Treason"

UNITY:

This letter is written to call the attention of the readers of UNITY to the remarkable play by John Haynes Holmes and now running on Broadway under the auspices of The Theatre Guild. It is entitled "If This Be Treason," and is altogether the most challenging bit of peace propaganda, or better, prophecy, that I have ever seen. Artistically, too, it is thoroughly "convincing." It seems absolutely real. It sums up in a glorious way all that Mr. Holmes has been saying about peace in his sermons, on the lecture platform, and at forums and in books for the last thirty years. It is heartening to know that the leading critics have given it appreciative commendations, and that the public, judging by the attendance, is giving it a generous hearing. Everybody who can should see it and boost it.

JAMES A. FAIRLEY.

White Plains, N. Y.

A Canadian Says Something About Britain

Editor of UNITY:

The National Message of British-Israel-World Federation says:

> India we call the jewel of the British Crown, where British rule is the greatest political phenomenon of our time and of all time. Great Britain, founded on the Bible, is the most beneficent Empire the world has ever known, and the benefactor of the colored races. It is the cornerstone upon which civilization and Christianity rest. The population has grown in a little over three centuries from six millions to some

450 millions, all enjoying the measure of freedom agreeing with their several capacities and governed by laws best suited to their respective conditions.

What do you think of that? Think and ponder on the conditions in India today. Think of the downtrodden Irish. And go back to the days of slavery in the Southern states, upheld and sanctioned by this great Empire. Think of the Pilgrim Fathers who escaped from the iron rule and persecution of the British to the shores of America and freedom. Think of Canada with a Governor General and numerous Lieut. Governors drawing large salaries from the Canadian people as figureheads of no material benefit to the country's welfare; merely holding these lucrative positions as representatives of the mother country.

Think of the wars, and the conquests carried on for no other purposes than gaining territory. Think of the serfs of a few hundred years ago, who were little better than slaves, who were flogged for disobedience to their masters and hanged or transported for sheep-stealing. Think of the greedy landlords of a more recent date, who paid the estate laborers ten shillings a week, who were obliged to steal turnips, potatoes, or any other thing they could lay their hands on, to keep them and their families from starvation. Think of the idle rich and the starving poor, then wonder at the audacity and stupidity of the B. I. W. F.

Stratford, Ontario. JOHN ROWLAND.

Praise—and Honest Opinion

Editor of UNITY:

I enclose check for three dollars in payment of my annual dues to UNITY. I do so cheerfully, though I am a farmer and the depression still bears down on me heavily in spite of the New Deal. UNITY is 100% sound on everything—*except* the money question; there it is all "wet."

W. B. CHAPMAN.

Correctionville, Iowa

The Divine

Editor of UNITY:

There is one touch of the *Divine* that makes the whole world kin.

Why continue the slogan "There is one touch of *Nature* that makes the whole world kin." It is the slogan of the animal trying to be better, why not aim for the highest, *The Divine,* is the soul of the world. Aim for that. What is best for all is the best for each.

Chicago, Illinois. JOHN W. BARWELL.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 62)

employers who in practice are lowering the standards of wages. For example, the Printing Trades Union of Greater New York—open to all without regard to race or creed—during the last three years have taken care of their unemployed. During that time the Typographical Union No. 6 spent over 8 million dollars for unemployment relief. Old age pensions, mortuary and hospital benefits and many other humanitarian activities, costing over 1 million dollars, have been one magnificent manifestation of the brotherhood of man as practiced by this same union, one of 18 unions comprising the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York City. How many churches can show such a record as that? . . . If you are getting your printing done under 10 per cent less than what union printers will charge, you may be sure that you are not only violating the standards of unionized labor but . . . in other words, the church is supporting chiselers.

The Union states that its method of work shall concern itself with promotional activities and cooperation with such groups as have as their objective the improvement of conditions and standards. Among its activities are regular and special meetings of the locals, symposia, conferences, taking part in delegations at hearings, consultation and cooperative action with other labor organizations. It plans to organize locals in principal centers throughout the country.

Henri Barbusse

The Commanding General of the Tenth Army cites in the order of the day the soldier Barbusse (Henri) of the Twenty-second Company, Thirty-first Regiment of Infantry, as a man of superior moral value. He enlisted voluntarily for the duration of the War, he refused to be put into the territorial reserves in spite of his age and the state of his health. He offered himself always for all dangerous missions.

These words from a French army order might stand as his epitaph. The soldier Henri Barbusse was a man of superior moral value who refused to be furloughed or discharged, and he fought his bravest battles after the War, when he was opposing the profiteers and the war-makers. By that time he was only the bullet-scarred shell of a man, his lungs half gone, his skin drawn tight over the skull, his flesh almost burned away by the fire of his purpose. The doctors kept warning him that every new task or journey would be his last. Still, he continued to travel over Europe and America, writing, editing magazines and delivering some of the most eloquent speeches since Karl Liebknecht and Jean Jaurès. "He offered himself always for all dangerous missions," and at the same time he did enough routine organizational work to have killed three younger men. He took a principal part in founding the Republican Association of Former Soldiers, which kept the French veterans from being used as fascist shock troops; he issued the call for the World Congress Against War. Less directly, but by force of argument and example, he helped to bring together the People's Front, an alliance of French middle-class and working-class parties that is the strongest existing barrier against fascism. Always he served as a liaison officer—between the literary generation of 1890 and that of 1930, between writers and factory workers, between liberals and Communists, even between Communists and Christians (as in his fine and neglected life of Jesus). His strictly literary influence was never great, but he had and deserved to have a tremendous moral prestige. People knew that he never spared himself or asked to be excused from a thankless job that had to be done. To the end, Barbusse was a good soldier.

Jane Addams and the Austrian Premier

In the fourth volume of "The War Memoirs of David Lloyd George" we find the British statesman telling this story:

"In 1916, Jane Addams, the famous American leader of women's movements, called upon me at Number 11 Downing Street on her return from a Continental tour. She had visited Germany, Austria, and France, and wished to tell me all about it, and at the same time influence me in the direction of peace. In Vienna she had had an interview with the Austrian Premier. Having explained to him that she had come there to find out whether it was not possible to bring this horrible war

to a peaceful end, she said: 'I have no doubt you are saying to yourself at this moment, this American woman is quite mad.' He replied: 'Mad? Do you see that door?' At this she thought he was terminating the interview brusquely, but he went on, 'Every hour of the day and far into the night men come through that door and say to me: We want more men for the trenches—we want more guns—more ammunition, more money. Mad, indeed? You are the only sensible person who has passed through that door for a long time.' "

When people begin to gather together from all over the world the stories that men can tell about the work and the spirit of Jane Addams, even the best informed may be astonished at the extent of her influence.

With the Apostle Paul she could write: "In labors more abundant . . .in journeyings often . . . in perils of waters . . . in perils by mine own countrymen . . . in weariness and faithfulness—in watchings often . . . besides such things as come upon me daily."

She is unquestionably one of our greatest Americans.

—*The Christian Leader.*

The Ten Commandments of Fascist Italy

Certainty that Il Duce is never wrong, confidence that he will carry them through to victory and disdain for surprises from the enemy are claims of the Black Shirt Troops which are to fight a war against Ethiopia. They have written their own "Ten Commandments," and the tablets handed down to the October 28th Division, a typical unit of enthusiastic Fascist volunteers, have become the code of all the Black Shirt militia.

Expecting soon to go into battle with the vision of Benito Mussolini before them, the men are not content with the Fascist motto, "Believe! Obey! Fight!" They have developed a further code, which was published here today, as follows:

1. The march of armed Black Shirts beyond the frontiers of the fatherland is a fulfillment of human justice and a victory of civilization.

2. Who follows the way of justice and civilization makes the contribution of his life.

3. This contribution up to the hour of combat, calls for capacity for frank renunciation and for any sacrifice; in peril, it calls for absolute certainty of beating the enemy.

4. Valor in battle is much, but not all; valor is also proved in the torment of waiting.

5. Believe! Obey! Fight!—no sooner said than done, under the Fascist regime. Believe—because one knows that El Duce can never be wrong. Obey—because one knows that all orders come from him. Fight—because one knows that battle under him means victory.

6. No enemy can surprise us, not even by swifter movements. Black Shirts have cat's eyes that ferret out and see far and they are always able to counter any attack.

7. No enemy can take advantage of his lesser needs for living; the Black Shirt has a soul of iron which puts the flesh under and silences all needs.

8. Whoever does not take jealous care of his arms, his war boots, the mule consigned to him, whoever loses a cartridge from his pouch by careless marksmanship or drinks water from his bottle at the first feeling of thirst, is not a Black Shirt. He is unscrupulous or a weakling, unfit to carry a rifle.

9. If any detachment, heavily engaged in face of the enemy, loses contact, its orders are not to wait. The order in this case is always—Forward to grenade distance, forward to dagger distance.

10. At the first cracking of rifles the Black Shirts will see the mighty figure of El Duce. They will see him enthroned in the background of the sky behind the enemy, like a gigantic vision, a heroic dream of war. This will be a spiritual reality, meaning that the Black Shirts, terrible and splendid, smash all resistance, bombs in hand, daggers between teeth and sovereign disdain for danger in their hearts.—John T. Whitaker, Rome Correspondent of the New York *Herald-Tribune,* in August 26th issue.

"The supreme issue, involving all others, is the encroachment of the powerful few upon the rights of the many."—ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE SR.

LaFOLLETTE'S

GREAT NATIONAL WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

THE PROGRESSIVE

Founded 1909, Regular Price $1.50 Per Year

Why do newspapers fool the public by distorting and suppressing news?

What is the PRACTICAL method of bringing about a real redistribution of the wealth of this nation so that every person will have a fair share?

What is the real story behind the so-called defenders of the constitution, the American Liberty league, and other similar agencies?

Get the answers to these and other vital questions from The Progressive.

DON'T BE MISLED OR UNINFORMED—THE PROGRESSIVE WILL BRING YOU THE FACTS AND THE PROOF!

Two Big Special Offers

1 Year..... (52 Issues) $1

10 Weeks..... (10 Issues) 20c

The Progressive is a unique publication. It accepts no paid advertising. It is therefore free from big business influence. It seeks to serve only its readers.

Facts suppressed by other papers exposed in every issue. Inside story of the new third party. How the La Follettes would break the depression and solve our economic problems. Many more sensational features. DON'T MISS THE NEXT FEW STARTLING ISSUES! ORDER TODAY!

THE PROGRESSIVE Dept. 34 Madison, Wis.